

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,231	08/26/2003	Yasunori Fukumitsu	59798 (47793)	6201
21874 75	03/28/2006		EXAMINER	
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP			HASSAN, AURANGZEB	
P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2182	
			DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Ep.	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	· <u>-</u>
	10/649,231	FUKUMITSU ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aurangzeb Hassan	2182	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
Period for Reply			
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI .136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI te, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 A	August 2003.		
	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application	n.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	ier.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 August 2003 and 2</u>		☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the	
Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	·	•	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
2. Certified copies of the priority documer		Application No.	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price.		•	
application from the International Burea	•		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies no	received.	
Attachment(s)	., C	O (DTO 440)	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	, _	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2182

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. There are three other copending applications with the same title, 10/649,228, 10/649,545, and 10/649,578. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1 - 8, 10 - 16, 18 and 20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 2 - 5, 7 - 13, of copending Application No.

Application/Control Number: 10/649,231

Art Unit: 2182

10/649,578. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

The mapping of each claim as drawn the corresponding double patenting application 10/649,578 is listed below:

Claim 1 of the pending application maps to claims 4 and 7 of 10/649,578,

Claim 2 of the pending application maps to claim 9 of 10/649,578,

Claim 3 of the pending application maps to claims 4 and 10 of 10/649,578,

Claim 4 of the pending application maps to claim 2 of 10/649,578,

Claim 6 of the pending application maps to claim 11 of 10/649,578,

Claim 7 of the pending application maps to claim 5 of 10/649,578,

Claim 8 of the pending application maps to claim 12 of 10/649,578,

Claim 10 of the pending application maps to claims 4, 7 and 13 of 10/649,578,

Claim 11 of the pending application maps to claims 4 and 8 of 10/649,578,

Claim 12 of the pending application maps to claims 4 and 8 of 10/649,578,

Claim 13 of the pending application maps to claim 9 of 10/649,578,

Claim 14 of the pending application maps to claim 2 of 10/649,578,

Claim 15 of the pending application maps to claim 3 of 10/649,578,

Claim 16 of the pending application maps to claim 11 of 10/649,578,

Application/Control Number: 10/649,231

Art Unit: 2182

Claim 20 of the pending application maps to claims 4, 8, 13 of 10/649,578,

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because 10/649,578 contains every element of the identified claims of the instant application and as such anticipates the identified claims of the instant application.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claims 1, 10, and 12 recite the limitation "said analysis result" in lines 31-32, and claim 20 recites the limitation "said analysis result" in lines 32-33. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Application/Control Number: 10/649,231

Art Unit: 2182

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aurangzeb Hassan whose telephone number is (571)272-8625. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Huynh can be reached on (571)272-4147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AH 3/15/2006

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

3/16/06

Page 5